

THE IRRIGATION REGULATION AMENDING BILL.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I rise to introduce a Bill for amending the Irrigation Regulation, III of 1072. The Bill has been published in the *Gazette* with the statement of objects and reasons and I beg to move that the Bill be read in Council.

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): I second the motion.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I shall now briefly explain the object of the Bill. The object is simple. But it may require some explanation. I shall begin with explaining the object of Section 23 itself, that is, the Section that is now sought to be amended. In Travancore, as elsewhere, agricultural lands lie in one block very commonly and these blocks are cultivated by their proprietors jointly. This is a common feature in Travancore and a very illustrative case may be cited in the cultivation of *punja* lands in Kuttanad. These fields lie without any apparent boundary marks and lie contiguous to one another. Two of the most important works to be done in the cultivation of these are, one, the putting up of ring bunds and two, the draining of the water in these fields. As is probably known to all the members of the House, the ring bunds are put up by the joint efforts of all the cultivators and all of them benefit thereby. It is put on their joint cost and joint labour. The water also is drained by the proprietors jointly. To say that one proprietor may put up the bund himself and drain the water himself so far as his own field is concerned, is very inequitable. To do so, is very much more than to put it himself and others together. Therefore, in practice, all these works are done jointly. Where there are a number of proprietors and one of them is unwilling to contribute his share of the cost of putting up the bund or draining the water, leaving it to the other proprietors to put up the bund or drain the water and incur the cost themselves, the question may arise as to whether the cost may not be recovered from the recalcitrant. No doubt, it may be said that they need put up the bund only around their own lands. But that is not the practice and that will cost more than if it were done for the recalcitrant owners' lands also. If thus bunds are put up by the others and the water is drained, naturally, the field of the recalcitrant will also be benefited. That is to say, the benefit thereof goes to the recalcitrant owner too. Section 23 lays down that when any of the proprietors fails or neglects to do his share of the work which ought to have been done by joint cost or joint labour and when the other owners are obliged to put the bund or drain the water, then the Division Peishkar or any other officer, specially authorised in this behalf, may make such order as he thinks fit. The Section further lays down that the Dewan Peishkar may himself execute the work and recover the cost. It will be noticed from Section 23 that there is a fundamental difference between the two sorts of works, *viz.*, the putting up of the bund and the draining of the

water. If there is 10,000 running feet of bund to be put up, one owner may take 2,000 feet, another 1,000, another 3,000 and so on. But in the case of draining water, it is not possible to say that one proprietor should drain so much of the water. Because of this difference, we can only say how the cost will have to be apportioned. Therefore two different provisions are necessary. Section 23 lays down only that if any recalcitrant owner fails to do a definite share of the work, that work may be carried out under the orders of the Division Peishkar, but it is silent as to what the proprietor or the recalcitrant owner should pay in the other case. It may be that Rs. 10,000 will be required for draining the water. But what is the share of the cost he is to pay? It is true an order may be passed by the Division Peishkar under Section 23 for apportioning the cost of draining the water; but it does not lay down expressly how that proportion of money may be recovered from the recalcitrant proprietor. The object of this amendment therefore is to make it clear that such money also may be recovered from the defaulting proprietor under the Revenue Recovery Regulation. With this explanation, if the members of the House will kindly read the Section as would be amended, which I have caused to be printed and circulated, they will see the purport of the amendment. Section 23 reads thus:

"23. Whenever, by local custom, any work for purposes of agriculture should be done by the joint labour or cost of the proprietors of all the lands benefited by such work, if any of such proprietors fails or neglects to do his share of the work or contribute his share of the cost or labour, it shall be lawful for the Division Peishkar or any officer specially authorised in this behalf, on the application of a reasonable number of proprietors interested in such work or injured by such failure or neglect, to investigate the matter and pass such order as he deems fit" etc.

Thus, it will be noticed that two classes of work are referred to in the first portion of the Section, namely, work done by joint labour and by joint cost. The second part then runs thus:

"If the order directs that the defaulting proprietor shall execute a portion of the work, it shall distinctly specify the portion of the work to be executed, the time within which it should be done and the estimated cost of such work. On the defaulting proprietor refusing or failing to execute the work within the time prescribed in the order, the cost of the work may be recovered from such defaulter, as arrears of land revenue and the work executed under the orders of the Division Peishkar or such officer as aforesaid".

This refers to the case where the work itself has to be done in specific shares. But the Section is silent in regard to works which have to be done as a whole, the cost alone being apportioned. The Section as it stands would apply to the case of putting up a ring bund. But it will not apply to the case of the draining of the water. Therefore, I have added at the end in the Section the necessary amendments. At the end of the first part of the Section, the following may be added:—

"and may also, by such order, direct the defaulting proprietor to execute any portion of the work or pay any portion of the cost of the work."

[Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai]

At the end of the second portion the following has to be added:—

"Any sum of money ordered to be paid under the provisions of this Section may also be recovered from the defaulting proprietor as arrears of land revenue and the amount so recovered paid to the party entitled to it."

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): When did the Department of Agriculture come into existence?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): About fifteen or twenty years ago, I think.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Was this Regulation not passed before that?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes, in one sense.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Is not the Director of Agriculture responsible for agricultural improvements?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Then why do you want the Peishkar to take the power and not the Director of Agriculture?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): "The Peishkar or any officer specially authorised in this behalf"—that is the provision that already exists.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Would it not be better if it is done by the officer who is responsible for the agricultural interests of the country?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I may point out to the member that it may be done by the Peishkar or any officer authorised in that behalf.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Why not remove the name of the Peishkar? How is he responsible for it?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): The amendment is not for that.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): He is now proposing an amendment. Now, there is a separate department dealing with agriculture. But, in the amendment, that power has not been transferred to the Agricultural Department. Is there any rule defining the share of responsibility of the Revenue Department and the Agricultural Department?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I think there is. If, for instance, my friend will look into the G. O. defining the powers of the Land Revenue and Income Tax Commissioner, it may give him what he wants.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Now that we have got an Agricultural Department and we are agitating for a separate Minor Irrigation Department, the question is upon whom the responsibility for irrigational matters should rest?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): If the House wants it to rest upon any other officer than the Division Peishkar, the Government may do so.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Does not Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai think it better to have the responsibility laid upon the officer habitually exercising it and therefore the Peishkar?

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): Has the Agricultural Director anything to do with irrigation?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): He has nothing to do with it.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolam*): Is it not a judicial matter and therefore will not a judicial officer be more fit?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): If my friend suggests a court of law, it would mean a lot of time and expense.

MR. K. I. JOSEPH (*Minachil cum Devicolam*): I am asking whether the Peishkar who is also a judicial officer is not the proper officer.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes, that he is.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): If an estimate has to be made, then who is better qualified to do the work—the Executive Engineer or the Peishkar?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): That will depend upon the nature of the estimate that has to be framed.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Who is to decide the quality of work that has to be done?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): It may be the Peishkar.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Is it not better to have it done by the Executive Engineer so that it may be done expeditiously?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): It may be.

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI (*Trivandrum cum Neduvangad*): Again it is said that the work must be done by a reasonable number of proprietors. 'Reasonable number' is indefinite. Why should there be a number of people for this purpose?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am not framing the Section afresh. All that I now propose to do is to carry out the intentions of the Section as already enacted. Strictly speaking, the amendment is only a verbal one.

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): Is there not a demand from the public for this purpose?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): There was a complaint and the matter was referred to the Government by the Land Revenue Commissioner and the amendment was taken up.

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): Is the order of the Dewan Peishkar appealable?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I think it is appealable. It is only a summary procedure and I believe a civil suit will lie.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Is there any provision for appeal to the Dewan from the decision of the Dewan Peishkar?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): If the Division Peishkar is the first deciding authority, I think the Government have the power.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Is not the Tahsildar also now an officer who decides?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Then no second appeal will lie from the decision of the Dewan Peishkar?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): No, no second appeal will lie.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Sir, while appreciating the interest evinced by the Government in the cause of the cultivators, especially of the Kuttanad region, I have to observe that certain faulty provisions occur in the proposed amendment. On the whole, the amendment itself is inadequate to meet the requirements of the people for whom it is intended. My friend Mr. Paramesvaran Pillai stated very correctly that the main difficulties that crop up in the cultivation of *punjabadam* fields centre round two points, that is, the putting up of ring bunds and also the baling out of water. The difficulty is a real difficulty and is probably accentuated by the fact that a resort to civil courts in such cases would not be of any timely assistance to the parties concerned. The usual authority therefore that has to be looked to in this connection, and is being looked to at present, is the revenue authority. The inadequacy of the provision investing the Dewan Peishkar alone with the authority has been realised by the Government long ago, so much so they have now empowered the Tahsildars also with the authority. But even that measure has been found insufficient for timely assistance to the parties concerned. The real difficulty is not visualised till about the time the operations have to commence; that is to say, the putting up of the ring bunds and the baling out of the water from the paddy fields have to be taken up generally after Tulam rains. The proprietors concerned would keep up

appearances till actually the work has to be taken in hand and, just about the commencement of Vrischikam one or two may non-co-operate and then an acute difficulty arises. It is at that particular juncture that the assistance of the Government officers would be needed. The Irrigation Regulation invests authority in certain revenue officers at present and they are expected to turn up and do the needful instantly. But, unfortunately, that does not take place. The result would be to allow a paddy field to lie fallow and the repercussion of the negligence of one or two or the non-co-operation of one or two would generally be realised too late. The Government would be compelled to face the facts when they are pressed to remit the kist due at the end. Sufficient attention, I am afraid, has not been paid to that aspect of the matter though repeated representations have been made to the Government for their interference. So, this particular provision for the Dewan Peishkar to investigate, calling upon the party to do the work, or ultimately to recover the costs, would actually prove fruitless. I would request the House to take that aspect of the matter into consideration whereby the Dewan Peishkar can do the work himself with the money at the disposal of the Government and ultimately realise it from the parties. Such a provision is absolutely necessary in the interests of the *punja* cultivators. That is the first point I have to mention.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): There is a provision in the Section already permitting the Peishkar to execute the work.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): My friend will certainly have no objection, I think, to make the provision more explicit.

Secondly, the provision here is that "the Division Peishkar or any other officer specifically authorised in this behalf on the application of a reasonable number of proprietors interested in such work or injured by such failure or neglect, to investigate the matter and pass such order and may also" etc. The Division Peishkar's authority under the Section as it exists here arises on a representation made by a *reasonable* number of proprietors interested in such work. That, I beg to submit, is the result of some confusion of thought; for, it is not the number of proprietors concerned in the thing that will have to move the Division Peishkar, but it is the interest concerned; for example, one person may be interested in 5,000 paras of paddy field in a particular block, while all the other proprietors may be the owners of fragmentary pieces here and there in one hundred paras. In the case of the person owning 5,000 paras, his representation cannot be listened to because he does not represent a reasonable number of people; on the other hand, if the owners of the fragmentary interest representing 100 paras are a reasonable number, then such people will be entitled to a hearing in the office of the Division Peishkar under the law as put forward by my friend. That, I beg to submit, is not quite a correct position, knowing as we do the method of transacting business in joint stock companies. It is the quantum of shares held by a particular person that will carry

[Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai]

weight and that may make his influence felt in the affairs of the company. Similarly, I say that the interest in the extent of block of the paddy field should have been taken into consideration instead of a reasonable number of the proprietors for whom my friend seems to have provided.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Suppose the 5,000 acres which my friend has been mentioning is being held by joint ownership and suppose the owners are in dispute and are not in a position to attend to the field, then will not the fragmentary portion suffer on account of their dispute?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Before I answer my friend's question, I want him to clear up certain difficulties in the wording of his question. First of all, he stated that the 5,000 acres are jointly held—

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Say by a *Marumakkattayam tarwad* which is not partitioned.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): The Karnavan is really in possession and responsibility; though the ultimate proprietorship is joint in one sense, the Karanavan is responsible. Under such circumstances, there cannot be any dispute between the Karanavan and other proprietors. That satisfies my friend, I suppose.

Therefore, my contention is this. Instead of looking at the heads of proprietors, we have to take into consideration the interests represented by the proprietors. Suppose it is a Hindu family, to change the illustration of my friend Mr. A. K. Pillai. Probably, the coparceners may be at sixes and sevens. There also, the extent of the interest concerned may be taken into consideration and adequate remedy may be supplied by the Division Peishkar or other officer designated under the Regulation. That is another objection that I have to urge against the fitness of the provision as it exists here.

Then, again, it is provided that the Division Peishkar or any officer specially authorised in this behalf may also, by such order, direct the defaulting proprietor to execute "any portion" of the work or pay any portion of the cost of the work. There again, it is a very indefinite provision and I would point out that it is for authorising the Division Peishkar to have a wayward course in his decision. Suppose a *pro rata* share of the cost or of the joint labour has to be met by a particular person. The Division Peishkar is authorised under the Section to direct him to do "any portion" of the work. The Division Peishkar may therefore say he may execute a portion of the work far in excess of the legitimate part or far less than that which would actually fall to his share.

That wording therefore requires modification and I therefore bring it to the notice of my friend. Again, the provision says:

"On the defaulting proprietor refusing or failing to execute the work within the time prescribed in the order, the cost of the work may be recovered from such defaulter as arrears of land revenue and the work executed under the orders of the Division Peishkar or such officer as aforesaid."

Now, with respect to that portion of the existing Section that the cost may be realised as arrears of land revenue, there is some difficulty. That is a difficulty experienced by myself in one of the cases which I had to argue before the authorities. Under the Irrigation Regulation, the Tahsildar or as the case may be the Division Peishkar, passes an order. Then it is sent to be executed by the revenue authorities. Under the Revenue Recovery Regulation, the order is being executed, and then, all on a sudden, certain developments may take place. For, though under the Irrigation Regulation there is nothing like a second appeal from the decision of the Division Peishkar to the Dewan, under the Revenue Recovery Regulation, certain provisions do exist which will enable the Dewan as final authority in revenue matters to interfere with the orders of the subordinates. So, even when the order is passed under the Irrigation Regulation, because the whole execution has to take place under the Revenue Recovery Regulation, the Dewan, though he has no authority as a special appellate authority, can yet interfere in the decisions of the Division Peishkar when the matter comes up in execution under the Revenue Recovery Regulation. That, I beg to submit, is an undesirable state of affairs. In one case, where a final order by the Division Peishkar had to be executed, the Huzur interfered and the order was nullified. The party in whose favour the Division Peishkar's order was passed had to suffer considerably and he had no further remedy especially in view of the fact that a civil suit was barred at the date when the Dewan as the final authority under Revenue Recovery Regulation interfered. Therefore, my submission with respect to that portion of the matter is this. If, as a matter of fact, under the Irrigation Regulation, the Dewan's powers do not touch the order of the Division Peishkar in the execution of such orders also, it must be specifically laid down that the Dewan should not interfere with the orders passed by the Division Peishkar. Such a thing is absolutely necessary for the protection of the order that a party obtains under the Irrigation Regulation. Otherwise, what is given by one hand may be taken away by the other, while the order is being enforced.

MR. V. SUBBA AIYAR (*Nominated*) (*Deputy President*): Does my friend mean that the Dewan can nullify the order?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That is practically the result. Of course, lapse of time has also contributed its share in that case. Otherwise, the Dewan's order itself would have been questioned in a civil court.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Was it set aside on the ground that the Division Peishkar had no authority?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): No, it was not that. I say an order under this particular Regulation, when executed under the Revenue Recovery Regulation, may be nullified as in one particular case.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): May I know whether there is any special season at which the proprietor of the *punja* land has to put up ring bunds?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Yes.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): When does he become a defaulter?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): The default would certainly occur more or less before the 15th Vrischikam.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Is it possible for the Division Peishkar to order the defaulter to execute the work?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): It will rather be difficult for the Division Peishkar to enforce his order.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Can the Division Peishkar enforce the defaulting proprietor to execute any portion of the work that has been already defaulted?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): He can make an order and ultimately may realise the money also; but the work may suffer.

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): Can he make the defaulting proprietor comply with his order and execute the work?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): No. It is something like taking a horse to the river and making it drink. The Division Peishkar can only pass an order.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I thought that there is a provision in the Bill for the timely execution of the work and the cost thereof to be shared.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): That is not quite so. The timely execution of the work is the matter that has to be attended to.

MR. A. K. PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Could not the interested persons execute the work in time?

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): In certain cases, they may be able. In certain other cases, they may not be able. They may be as poor as church mice.

Sir, these are the points that I wish prominently to bring to the notice of the House and, if my friend has no objection, these observations of mine may also be kept in view when the matter is considered by the Select Committee. With this expression of opinion, I have to say that I have absolutely no objection to the measure being referred to a Select Committee consisting of persons who know something about the cultivation of *punja* lands.

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the amending Bill brought forward by the Law Member. The Bill read out to us has been asked for by the cultivators of Kuttanad as being very necessary for the cultivation of their paddy lands. I know instances where for want of a provision like this, paddy lands covering 800 and 900 paras have been left fallow for years together, so that, the men were unable to stand the strain and had to sell their lands. That being the case, the amendment as suggested by the Law Member is very necessary. But it has to go further, especially with regard to the time fixed within which the Division Peishkar may be enabled to pass an order. In regard to that point, some modification is necessary. Again, power also should be vested in the Division Peishkars and also the officers of the Public Works Department who generally have to deal with such works. My own suggestion is that rather than entrusting this power to Government officers, something like a block board consisting of four or five non-officials of the locality, as in South Travancore, may be formed and they will be able to advise and direct the joint cultivation of these lands. As a matter of practice, though these large paddy fields are cultivated on co-operative lines—

MR. K. SIVARAMA PANIKKAR (*Shertallai*): May I know whether he is supporting or opposing the amendment?

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): I am supporting it, with this modification.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): May I know whether he is aware of the strange experience that South Travancore people have in regard to block boards there?

MR. K. K. THOMAS (*Kottayam*): That may not be the case with North Travancore. On the basis of co-operation, people have been reclaiming large areas of *kayals*. It may be that one or two owners quarrel among themselves causing loss, inconvenience and sometimes destruction to the cultivators of the whole block. So, I have great pleasure in supporting the amendment. My only request is that it may go a little further and embody the provisions suggested by my friend Mr. P. K. Narayana Pillai.

PRESIDENT: May I take it that the House accepts the principle of the Bill?

The motion was carried.

The Secretary then read the title of the Bill.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I beg to move that the Bill be referred to a select Committee consisting of Messrs. K. K. Thomas, P. K. Narayana Pillai, T. Kumara Pillai, C. Keralavarma Koil Tampuran, R. Krishna Pillai, Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai and myself.

MR. P. K. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha*): Mr. Mammen Mapillai is himself a cultivator.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes. Probably, there will not be much to be done with regard to this Bill itself. But the discussion in the Select Committee may prove very useful to me if and when the Regulation is taken up for amendment. I have no objection whatever to include Mr. Mammen Mapillai as a member of the Select Committee.

MR. P. N. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Secretary to Government*): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT: May I take it that the House approves the *personnel* of the Committee?

The motion was carried.

PRESIDENT: Mr. Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai will be the Chairman of the Committee. The Committee will submit their report within two months.

TIME-LIMIT DURING BUDGET DISCUSSION.

PRESIDENT: I will just inform you the time allotted in regard to the discussion which will follow in the next few days. The general discussion on the budget will take place on the 1st and 2nd August and the voting of demands for grants will take place during the seven days beginning from the 5th August. One full day each is allowed for the voting of grants to the Public Works Department, the Education Department and the Land Revenue Department. The other demands will be given half a day each. During the general discussion, each member other than the Financial Secretary will be allowed 20 minutes. When voting on demands, every mover and the official member who has a right of reply will be allowed 10 minutes each and the other members 5 minutes each. This arrangement of the business during the budget discussion will be strictly adhered to and I hope the members will also co-operate, for their mutual good, in adhering closely to the time-limit.

The Council will now adjourn and re-assemble at half past eleven on Monday morning.

The Council adjourned at 1-20 P. M.

T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.